

### **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed 3/12/2008.

Although Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 7, and 17 via the current amendment, Applicants wish to emphasize that they are not conceding in this response that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Applicants are appreciative for the recognized allowable subject matter. This response should obviate outstanding issues and make the remaining claims allowable. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of this response.

### **STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 17-19 are pending.

Claims 6 and 12-16 were previously cancelled.

Claims 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention, **but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection.**

Claims 1, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as being anticipated by Jackson et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0103823).

**Claims 2-5 and 9-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.**

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> ¶**

Claims 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection. Specifically, the Examiner has objected to the following phrase in the preamble: “emulation of real user access” as the body of the claim does not specifically recite such emulation. Applications have made a clarifying amendment to independent claim 17 to correct this issue. Specifically, the feature of “automatically accessing said content using said combinations of entries as HTML input for a webcrawler” has been amended to recite “emulating real user access to World Wide Web content dynamically accessible via an HTML form by automatically accessing said content using said combinations of entries as HTML input for a webcrawler”. Applicants wish to note that this amendment has been done without adding any new matter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection with respect to independent claim 17. Also, since the only objections to claims 18-19 relate to their dependence from a previously objected claim, Applicants also respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection with respect to dependent claims 18 and 19.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) ¶**

Claims 1, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jackson et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0103823).

Claims 2-5 and 9-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Independent claim 1 has been rewritten with the allowable features of dependent claim 2. Hence, pending claim 1 is in allowable form. Dependent claims 3-5 are in allowable form as they depend from an allowable claim, i.e., claim 1.

Independent claim 7 has been rewritten with the allowable features of dependent claims 8 and 9. Hence, pending claim 7 is in allowable form. Dependent claims 10-11 are in allowable form as they depend from an allowable claim, i.e., claim 7.

Although Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 7, and 17 via the current amendment, it should once again be noted that Applicants wish to emphasize that they are not conceding in this response that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

**SUMMARY**

As has been detailed above, none of the references, cited or applied, provide for the specific claimed details of Applicants' presently claimed invention, nor renders them obvious. It is believed that this case is in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof and early issuance is respectfully requested.

As this response has been timely filed, no request for extension of time or associated fee is required. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies in the fees provided to Deposit Account No. 09-0441.

If it is felt that an interview would expedite prosecution of this application, please do not hesitate to contact Applicants' representative at the below number.

Respectfully submitted,

*/ramraj soundararajan/*

Ramraj Soundararajan  
Registration No. 53,832

IP AUTHORITY, LLC.  
4821A Eisenhower Ave  
Alexandria, VA 22304  
(703) 461-7060

June 12, 2008